

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-34 and 36-38 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 12, 13, and 17 are requested to be amended.

Claims 31-38 are requested to be canceled without prejudice.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-23, 25-34, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Conrad (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,527). With regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Conrad fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite “a server located in the docking area and comprising a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data.” Applicant believes that Conrad does not teach, disclose, or suggest “a server located in the docking area and comprising a wireless docking area transceiver, a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received by the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received by the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data” as included in the combination of elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are thus

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

patentable over Conrad for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and Applicant further requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn as well.

With regard to claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that Conrad fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 12 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 12 has been amended to recite "wherein the first transceiver is included as part of a server located in the docking area, the server comprising the first transceiver, a second satellite receiver, and a second storage unit, the server being configured to store the order data, wherein the order data is received by the second satellite receiver, and to store the data representative of video, wherein the data representative of video is received by the second satellite receiver and stored in the second storage unit in response to the order data." Applicant believes that Conrad does not teach, disclose, or suggest "wherein the first transceiver is included as part of a server located in the docking area, the server comprising the first transceiver, a second satellite receiver, and a second storage unit, the server being configured to store the order data, wherein the order data is received by the second satellite receiver, and to store the data representative of video, wherein the data representative of video is received by the second satellite receiver and stored in the second storage unit in response to the order data" as included in the combination of elements of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that Conrad fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 13 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 13 has been amended to recite "a server located in the docking area and comprising a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received from the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received from the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data, the server further comprising a first means for transmitting first data, at least a portion of the first data including the video data and the order wire data." Applicant believes that Conrad does not teach, disclose, or suggest "a server located in the docking area and comprising a first satellite receiver, and a first storage unit, the server being configured to store order wire data received from the first satellite receiver, and to store video data received from the first satellite receiver in the storage unit in response to the order wire data,

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

the server further comprising a first means for transmitting first data, at least a portion of the first data including the video data and the order wire data" as included in the combination of elements of claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 14-16 depend from claim 13 and are thus patentable over Conrad for at least the same reasons as claim 13, and Applicant further requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn as well.

With regard to claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that Conrad fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 17 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 17 has been amended to recite the use of "a server comprising a transmitter, a satellite receiver, and a storage unit" for "storing order wire data in the storage unit, wherein the order wire data is received by the satellite receiver," and "storing video data in the storage unit, wherein the video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data." Applicant believes that Conrad does not teach, disclose, or suggest the use of "a server comprising a transmitter, a satellite receiver, and a storage unit" for "storing order wire data in the storage unit, wherein the order wire data is received by the satellite receiver," and "storing video data in the storage unit, wherein the video data is received by the satellite receiver and stored in the storage unit in response to the order wire data" as included in the combination of elements of claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 18-30 depend from claim 17 and are thus patentable over Conrad for at least the same reasons as claim 17, and Applicant further requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn as well.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,527) in view of Official Notice taken of "the fact that passenger entertainment systems embodied in road vehicles (i.e., buses), for the purpose of providing passengers with video entertainment and other interactive services." Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 24 depends from claim 17. As explained above, Conrad does

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1 or claim 17. Official Notice was taken only of "the fact that passenger entertainment systems embodied in road vehicles (i.e., buses), for the purpose of providing passengers with video entertainment and other interactive services," and it thus fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 1 or claim 17 mentioned above that are lacking in Conrad. Because the cited combination of Conrad in view of the Official Notice fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1 or claim 17 as combined therein, and because claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 24 depends from claim 17, claim 8 and claim 24 are patentable over the Conrad in view of the Official Notice for at least the same reasons as claim 1 and claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 8 and claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/21/2005By Chad E. Bement

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

Chad E. Bement
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,991